

MILITARY PERSONAL PROPERTY AND CLAIMS SYMPOSIUM

23 September 2003

**Holiday Inn Eisenhower Metro Center
2460 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22314**

Military Chairperson

Colonel Thomas G. Keller

Industry Chairperson

Mr. Steve Hollingsworth

AGENDA SUMMARY

0830 hours – 0840 hours	Opening Comments
0840 hours – 0915 hours	Digital Certificates Presentation (Item 300)
0915 hours – 1200 hours	Topics
1200 hours – 1300 hours	Lunch Break
1300 hours – 1500 hours	Topics

OLD BUSINESS

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PROPOSERS</u>
149-150 202-244	Defense Transportation Regulation (DTR) Part IV DOD 4500.9R August 2003	American Moving and Storage Association Household Goods forwarders Association United States Transportation Command
122-123	DD Form 619-619-1 (DTR)	American Moving and Storage Association United States Transportation Command
177	Review of Transit Guide (Transit Times)	Household Goods Forwarders Association United States Transportation Command
189	Transit Times – Code 4 Shipments - Korea to Hawaii	Household Goods Forwarders Association Carrier Qualification and Performance Team
264	Long Deliveries out of SIT vs. Deliveries out of SIT beyond 30/50 miles radius	American Moving and Storage Association Operations Team

NEW BUSINESS

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PROPONENTS</u>
284	Establishment of AOOs	American Moving and Storage Association Military Services (USAF)
285	MTMC Website	American Moving and Storage Association Personal Property Systems Team
286	Rate Solicitations, Item 424, Note- Destination Agent Selection	American Moving and Storage Association Domestic and International Rates Team
288	Item 412 (Loading & Unloading Charges-Bulky Articles) -Large-Screen Televisions	American Moving and Storage Association Domestic and International Rates Team
289	Paperwork on TQAP appeals	American Moving and Storage Association Carrier Qualification and Performance Team
290	Salvage Agreement-Memorandum of Understanding; How long does the Claims office has to resolve Member salvage reluctance?	American Moving and Storage Association Military Claims Services/DFAS
291	Positive Tracing Action – Where does Industry sends the recovered items?	American Moving and Storage Association Military Claims Services
292	Plastic Totes	Alaska Movers Association Operations Team
293	Extending RDDs	American Moving and Storage Association Operations Team
294	Retroactive Conversion/SIT Expiration	American Moving and Storage Association Military Claims Services
295	Bulky Articles	American Moving and Storage Association Domestic and International Rates Team
296	Agent Representative in TOPS	American Moving and Storage Association Military Claims Services
297	Batch Mail Dates	American Moving and Storage Association Carrier Qualification and Performance Team

NEW BUSINESS (continued)

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PROPONENTS</u>
298	Saturation Notices	American Moving and Storage Association Operations Team
299	PPCIG Format	American Moving and Storage Association Personal Property Systems Team
300	Digital Certificate	American Moving and Storage Association Carrier Qualification and Performance Team
301	Delayed Setoff Notices	American Moving and Storage Association Military Claims Services/DFAS
302	Estimates for Replacement Costs	American Moving and Storage Association Military Claims Services
303	Table of Weights and Depreciation Guide	Household Goods Forwarders Military Claims Services/DFAS
304	Non-Temp Storage Issues	American Moving Storage Association Personal Property Program & Acquisition Services Branch

ITEM: 122

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: United States Transportation Command

SUBJECT: 619 Forms and the DTR

INITIATED: March 1, 2000

DISCUSSION: At the last M/I, in September 1999, the USTRANSCOM representative failed to notify Industry that the DTR - Part IV had been issued six weeks prior to the M/I, on August 2. The first indication that the DTR - Part IV had been approved was provided in late October, with an official copy provided to the Associations in December. We further learned that the DTR included a new version of the DD Form 619, dated October 1998. No mention of the new 619 forms was made to Industry at any point within the first year of the form's existence.

Efforts to revise the DD Form 619 were the subject of several M/I items and other meetings in the early 1990s, but our records indicate that these discussions ceased in 1993 when Ms. Vivian Washington, the original point of contact, was assigned other duties in a reorganization of MTMC. We were therefore completely surprised to learn that a different version of the form was finalized and published five years later. As an example, one of the suggestions being considered was to combine the two forms.

DOD often espouses the virtues of partnering with Industry. Partnership requires some communication, and this type of form that is used on a regular basis by the Industry should have some Industry input in its design. Furthermore, once a new form is adopted, DOD needs to let us know and provide an adequate lead-time to eliminate stocks of the old version and print copies of the new one prior to implementation.

RECOMMENDATION: Military and Industry representatives should work together to determine whether the new version of the DD Form 619 and 619-1 would meet everyone's needs, including whether the forms should be combined. If the new version is determined to be superior, movers should be permitted to phase in usage of the form after exhausting their existing supplies. Some military bases are requiring agents to start using the form on April 1, 2000, or some other arbitrary date. They should be advised to work with agents

to transition to whatever version makes the most sense. Finally, Industry should be advised if any other forms are being revised.

RESPONSE: Industry expressed concern as to why the loss and damage section is on the new DD Form 619. USTRANSCOM will reexamine the 619 forms and suggested Industry provides input on problems they are experiencing with the new 619.

Industry requested to continue the use of the old DD Form 619 until their stockpile is depleted. The old DD Form 619 may be used until September 30, 2001; afterwards, Industry must use the new DD Form 619 in accordance with the newly published DTR.

August 15, 2000: Industry may use the old DD Form 619 until all supplies are exhausted. Once Industry starts using the new DD Form 619, they need to identify the problems with the form and submit them to the Military Traffic Management Command, Attn: MTPP-SH.

January 29, 2001: USTRANSCOM will publish the DTR on the Federal Register to solicit industry inputs on April 24, 2001. Industry needs to submit their inputs to USTRANSCOM by July 16, 2001. USTRANSCOM will finalize the DTR with changes on July 25, 2001.

August 10, 2001: Changes to the administrative process of updating the various parts of the DTR forced us to slide the release date for DTR Part IV, Personal Property. Upon conclusion of coordination with the Military Services, DTR Part IV will be placed on the Federal Register for public comment. We look for Service coordination by late September and anticipate making DTR Part IV available for public comment by mid-November.

February 7, 2002: It was agreed during the 15 Aug 00 meeting that "Once Industry starts using the new DD Form 619, they need to identify the problems with the form and submit them to the Military Traffic Management Command, Attn: MTPP-SH." To date, we have received no input for proposed changes to the DD 619. It should be noted that making a change to a DD form takes about 8 months to coordinate through OSD with all of the Services. Recommend this item be closed. Proposed changes will be worked when they are submitted.

September 18, 2002: Put on hold until the release of new changes to the DTR.

February 20, 2003: Put on hold until the release of new changes to the DTR.

August 8, 2003: DTR changes posted.

SUMMARY: Industry will use the old DD form 619 until supplies are exhausted.

Closed 23 Sep 03

ITEM: 123

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: United States Transportation Command and
Personal Property Systems Team

SUBJECT: New 619

INITIATED: March 1, 2000

DISCUSSION: There is no longer a 6-cube carton. It has been replaced with an 8-cube carton. Why?

Also, on the SIT section there is a new block called “ordered out” (13e). What is the purpose of this block?

If SIT delivery and re-weighs are supposed to be entered on the 619-1, why are they also listed on the 619?

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should respond to the questions and explain how these forms are to be used.

RESPONSE:

The DD Form 619, Oct 1998 has a place for the 6 or 6.5-cube carton listed under Accessorial Services (16v.) that reads “Cartons (over 4 cu. ft/less than 7cu. Ft.)” If both carton are used please list either 6 cubic or 6.5 cubic in the remarks section and place the cost in 16dd other.

The “ordered out” block is the date the Transportation Office would like property delivered out. The “Delivered Out” block is the actual date the property is delivered.

The Transportation Office has the choice to ask for a reweigh at any point of travel before the destination. The DD Form 619 “says if applicable” if not applicable please don’t use.

RESPONSE: *Industry expressed concern as to why the loss and damage section is on the new DD Form 619. Mr. Mike Cress said USTRANSCOM will reexamine the 619 form and suggested Industry provide input on problems they are experiencing with the new 619.*

Industry requested to continue the use of the old DD Form 619 until their stockpile is depleted. The old DD Form 619 may be used until September 30, 2001; afterwards, Industry must use the new DD Form 619 in accordance with the newly published DTR.

August 15, 2000: Industry may use the old DD Form 619 until all supplies are exhausted. Once Industry starts using the new DD Form 619, they need to identify the problems with the form and submit them to the Military Traffic Management Command, Attn: MTPP-SH.

January 29, 2001: USTRANSCOM will publish the DTR on the Federal Register to solicit industry inputs on April 24, 2001. Industry needs to submit their inputs to USTRANSCOM by July 16, 2001. USTRANSCOM will finalize the DTR with changes on July 25, 2001.

August 10, 2001: Changes to the administrative process of updating the various parts of the DTR forced us to slide the release date for DTR Part IV, Personal Property. Upon conclusion of coordination with the Military Services, DTR Part IV will be placed on the Federal Register for public comment. We look for Service coordination by late September and anticipate making DTR Part IV available for public comment by mid-November.

February 7, 2002: It was agreed during the 15 Aug 00 meeting that "Once Industry starts using the new DD Form 619, they need to identify the problems with the form and submit them to the Military Traffic Management Command, Attn: MTPP-SH." To date, we have received no input for proposed changes to the DD 619. It should be noted that making a change to a DD form takes about 8 months to coordinate through OSD with all of the Services. Recommend this item be closed. Proposed changes will be worked when they are submitted.

September 18, 2002: Put on hold until the release of new changes to the DTR.

February 20, 2003: Put on hold until the release of new changes to the DTR.

August 8, 2003: DTR changes posted.

SUMMARY: Industry may use the old DD Form 619 until the supplies are exhausted.

Closed 23 Sep 03

ITEM: 149

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: U.S. Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM)

SUBJECT: Defense Transportation Regulations (DTR) - Part IV

INITIATED: August 15, 2000

DISCUSSION: Through various channels it was determined that the newly issued DTR (August 1999) would require a review and amendment.

RECOMMENDATION: Industry should be provided an update on the status of the USTRANSCOM review and re-write/amendment of the DTR – Part IV.

RESPONSE:

January 29, 2001: USTRANSCOM will publish the DTR on the Federal Register to solicit industry inputs on April 24, 2001. Industry needs to submit their inputs to USTRANSCOM by July 16, 2001. USTRANSCOM will finalize the DTR with changes on July 25, 2001.

August 10, 2001: Changes to the administrative process of updating the various parts of the DTR forced us to slide the release date for DTR Part IV, Personal Property. Upon conclusion of coordination with the Military Services, DTR Part IV will be placed on the Federal Register for public comment. We look for Service coordination by late September and anticipate making DTR Part IV available for public comment by mid-November.

SUMMARY: Industry expressed concern as whether there is sufficient time for USTRANSCOM consider Industry's input prior to publishing the final DTR.

February 27, 2002: CD copies of the DTR-Part IV final draft were given to AMSA on February 25, 2002 and to HHGFAA on February 27, 2002. Industry will have 60 days to comment back to USTRANSCOM with USTRANSCOM responding back on the comments in 30 days. The symposium members recommended changing the estimated effective date for the DTR-Part IV to October 2002.

September 18, 2002: Put on hold until the release of new changes to the DTR.

February 20, 2003: Put on hold until the release of new changes to the DTR.

August 8, 2003: DTR changes posted.

SUMMARY: Closed 23 Sep 03

ITEM: 150

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: U.S. Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM)

SUBJECT: Updates to DTR - Part IV

INITIATED: August 15, 2000

DISCUSSION: At the last M/I meeting, USTRANSCOM indicated that they were working on updates or revisions to the new DTR - Part IV. This document is obviously very important to the industry, and we would like to be involved in these revisions.

RECOMMENDATION: DOD should provide an update on the progress of the DTR revisions detailing which items are being revised or updated and the impact of the revisions.

RESPONSE:

January 29, 2001: USTRANSCOM will publish the DTR on the Federal Register to solicit industry inputs on April 24, 2001. Industry needs to submit their inputs to USTRANSCOM by July 16, 2001. USTRANSCOM will finalize the DTR with changes on July 25, 2001.

August 10, 2001: Changes to the administrative process of updating the various parts of the DTR forced us to slide the release date for DTR Part IV, Personal Property. Upon conclusion of coordination with the Military Services, DTR Part IV will be placed on the Federal Register for public comment. We look for Service coordination by late September and anticipate making DTR Part IV available for public comment by mid-November.

SUMMARY: Industry expressed concern as whether there is sufficient time for USTRANSCOM consider Industry's input prior to publishing the final DTR.

February 27, 2002: CD copies of the DTR-Part IV final draft were given to AMSA on February 25, 2002 and to HHGFAA on February 27, 2002. Industry will have 60 days to comment back to USTRANSCOM with USTRANSCOM responding back on the comments in 30 days. The symposium members recommended changing the estimated effective date for the DTR-Part IV to October 2002.

September 18, 2002: Put on hold until the release of new changes to the DTR.

February 20, 2003: Put on hold until the release of new changes to the DTR.

August 8, 2003: DTR changes posted.

SUMMARY: Closed 23 Sep 03

ITEM: 177

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: United States Transportation Command

SUBJECT: Review of Transit Guide (Transit Times)

INITIATED: February 13, 2001

DISCUSSION: The DTS has many errors in labeling and actual omission in the transit times guide. This has been pointed out to MTMC a number of times with no action/correction to date.

Example: Page BK19 shows GE and is in fact GE, however BK23 is labeled GE and so is BK27. Pages BK33 through 40 are all marked NE. This should be corrected.

In addition, the transit time guides themselves have to be reviewed and adjusted for the continuing deteriorating (and vanishing) American Flag ocean carrier service available.

RECOMMENDATION: That the DTS be reviewed/corrected and that Transit Time guides be adjusted with operative input from industry, including the American Flag steamship operators.

RESPONSE: *USTRANSCOM stated in response to the first part of Item 177, the problem with Appendix BK, as well as a similar problem with Appendix BL, have been identified to us and corrected versions will appear in Change 1 to the Defense Transportation Regulation (DTR) Part IV, Personal Property.*

MTMC agrees the transit times need to be reviewed and changed as necessary, and will develop a plan to make corrections. MTMC desires to have all transit times not to exceed 60 days. MTMC will follow on with Industry to resolve transit discrepancies. This review should be completed by 9 November 2001.

SUMMARY:

February 19, 2002: MTMC met with AMSA on 28 November 2001 to discuss this item MTMC and completed its review. Need feedback from HHGFAA on transit times with less than 10 days and greater than 70 days. MTMC had completed a new transit table for International ITGBL and presently working the Domestic. The DTR will be tentatively released to the Federal Register in February 2002. Transit times changes will be incorporated with the DTR.

February 27, 2002: CD copies of the DTR-Part IV final draft were given to AMSA on February 25, 2002 and to HHGFAA on February 27, 2002. Industry will have 60 days to comment back to USTRANSCOM with USTRANSCOM responding back on the comments in 30 days. The symposium members recommended changing the estimated effective date for the DTR-Part IV to October 2002.

HHGFAA will provide MTMC with a list of recommended exceptions to the transit times.

September 18, 2002: Put on hold until the release of new changes to the DTR.

February 20, 2003: Put on hold until the release of new changes to the DTR.

August 8, 2003: DTR changes posted.

Transit times for household goods and unaccompanied baggage shipments in inter/intra-theater moves for the IS04 (1 Apr 04 – 30 Sep 04) rate cycle will stay the same as the transit times in the current rate cycle, IW03 (1 Oct 03 – 31 Mar 04). Transit times for all non-inter/intra-theater shipments for the IS04 rate cycle will use the new transit times specified in the IS04 solicitation.

Closed 23 Sep 03

ITEM: 189

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualification and Performance Team

SUBJECT: Transit Times - Code 4 Shipments - Korea to Hawaii

INITIATED: February 13, 2001

DISCUSSION: In the past, carriers had the option of sending Code 4 shipments from Korea to Hawaii via the West Coast. They would be loaded into a west coast bound container with CONUS freight, reworked at the west coast port and loaded into a different container destined to Hawaii.

With the advent of Code 3 this is no longer operationally possible. Containers must now go directly from Korea to Hawaii. There is not always sufficient enough freight to do this on a regular basis and, reportedly, the steamship lines will not accept LCL cargo.

Therefore, the carriers have no choice but to hold the Korea to Hawaii cargo until there's enough for a full container. As a result, shipments are prone to miss their RDDs.

Penalizing carriers for this under TQAP will not make a difference in the service provided. The missed RDDs are being caused by the switch to Code 3, not improper traffic management on our part.

RECOMMENDATION: Review/change the transit times to take into consideration that Code 4 shipments can no longer be co-loaded to the West Coast as in the past.

RESPONSE: *MTMC is still awaiting recommendations with supporting documentation from industry. MTMC remains open to changing transit times as long as the recommendations are substantiated by evidence/proof of why the change is warranted.*

SUMMARY: *Closed 23 Sep 03*

ITEM: 202

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: United States Transportation Command

SUBJECT: Defense Transportation Regulations - Part IV

INITIATED: September 11, 2001

DISCUSSION: Industry was advised several months ago that Change 1 would be issued to Part IV of the DTR in the Spring of 2001. No information or Federal Register Notice has appeared to date.

RECOMMENDATION: Please advise the status of Change 1 to the DTR-Part IV and, if known, the targeted date of release for public comment, as well as any planned effective date of the changes.

RESPONSE: *Combine this item with the following items:*

Item 122, 619 Forms and the DTR

Item 123, New 619

Item 149, Defense Transportation Regulation (DTR) – Part IV

Item 150, Updates to DTR – Part IV

SUMMARY: *CD copies of the DTR-Part IV final draft were given to AMSA on February 25, 2002 and to HHGFAA on February 27, 2002. Industry will have 60 days to comment back to USTRANSCOM with USTRANSCOM responding back on the comments in 30 days. The symposium members recommended changing the estimated effective date for the DTR-Part IV to October 2002.*

September 18, 2002: Put on hold until the release of new changes to the DTR.

February 20, 2003: Put on hold until the release of new changes to the DTR.

August 8, 2003: DTR changes posted

SUMMARY: *Closed 23 Sep 03*

ITEM: 244

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: United States Transportation Command

SUBJECT: DTR Change 1

INITIATED: September 18, 2002

DISCUSSION: DOD has sought industry comments on Change 1 to the DTR. Comments have been submitted, including some pointing out the need for advance lead-time before the effective date of the changes.

RECOMMENDATION: DOD should indicate what the timetable is for release of Change 1 and for its effective date.

SUMMARY: *DTR Draft was posted on the Federal Register for Industry review. USTRANSCOM is reviewing Industry input for inclusion into the DTR. Proposed update to be coordinated with MTMC and the Military Services (as applicable) within the next 30 days. Once coordination is complete and final determination is made regarding inputs, a Federal Register notice will be made announcing findings.*

September 18, 2002: *Put on hold until the release of new changes to the DTR.*

February 20, 2003: *Put on hold until the release of new changes to the DTR.*

August 8, 2003: *DTR changes posted.*

SUMMARY: *Closed 23 Sep 03*

ITEM: 264

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Operations Teams

SUBJECT: Long Deliveries out of SIT vs. Deliveries out of SIT beyond 30/50 mile radius

INITIATED: January 28, 2003

DISCUSSION: A Long Delivery out of SIT occurs when a shipment is in an SIT status and the Transportation Office (TO) orders the shipment to be delivered to the member's destination address that is beyond that TO's Area of Responsibility (AOR) and is in another destination TO's AOR. Then the first TO is required to order the carrier to make delivery of the shipment to this new location and prepares a Certificate of Long Delivery out of SIT and issues it to the carrier and notifies the new destination TO of the delivery service ordered.

Shipments delivering from SIT under the Domestic and International solicitations have an agreed to delivery radius of 30 miles for domestic and 50 miles for international, with provisions for deliveries that are beyond these distances. The agreed to mileage is for rate applications and is calculated from the carriers SIT warehouse and the delivery address. Each solicitation has rules and rates that apply for any address. Each solicitation has rules and rates that apply for any additional mileage from SIT warehouse and destination address. The carrier prepares a DD 619-1 with all accessorial information and submits to the destination TO for certification. The key here is that the delivery is still within the original TO's AOR.

The problem is that GSA Audits has recently started requiring certification by the TO on all deliveries out of SIT beyond the 30/50 mile distance and not just on deliveries outside of an AOR.

RECOMMENDATION: GSA Audits needs to accept the MTMC definition of long deliveries requiring certification so that PPSOs are not deluged with requests to go back and certify them on all of the old shipments that GSA is auditing. Alternatively, DOD needs to revise whatever rule is necessary to avoid excessive paperwork by PPSOs in certifying deliveries.

RESPONSE: *A Personal Property Advisory message (DTG 222114Z SEP 03) was disseminated to all personal property shipping offices. A copy of the advisory message and the TRANSCOM clarification letter have been placed on the MTMC web site. Also, GSA has stated that they will comply with the TRANSCOM clarification.*

SUMMARY: *Closed 23 Sep 03*

ITEM: 284

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Service (USAF)

SUBJECT: Establishment of AOOs

INITIATED: August 12, 2003

DISCUSSION: The definition of Area of Operation (AOO) in the DTR is “A specifically defined geographic area established by a transportation office (TO) within an area of responsibility for traffic distribution purposes. Areas of operation are established in response to the specific economic and transportation sectors existing in an area of responsibility to facilitate an efficient working relationship with DOD-approved carriers.” Our concern is that the Air Force may not have properly considered economic and transportation factors in establishing AOOs for the large JPPSOs. Some of the AOOs are too large to be serviced by any one local agent, which leads to all sorts of operational difficulties for the movers to service shipments in those AOOs.

RECOMMENDATION: The Air Force should indicate what methodology was used in determining the AOOs for the large super-JPPSOs. In addition, the group should discuss lessons learned from the process so far, and any suggestions for improving the current structures of the AOOs as presently constituted in order to make it easier to service shipments.

RESPONSE: *The methodology used in determining the AOOs in the AF regionalization of what is now JPPSO-COS and JPPSO-SAT AOR was based upon the perceived direction that the future personal property program was heading and at the request of the carrier industry. The AF took industries concerns into consideration based upon their fears of a lack of adequate agency representation to provide service to one large AOR. AOOs were established based upon an efficient working relationship with DOD approved carriers by looking at locations of the bases within each state, the AOR that the JPPSO's would assume, workload generated by that AOR and to provide the industry and the JPPSO's greater flexibility. The contention that some of the AOOs are too large to be serviced by any one local agent is without foundation. Many PPSOs have large AORs that range from 200-500 + miles and are serviced by those agents/carriers who filed LOIs with those PPSOs.*

For example, JPPSO-COS's AOR before regionalization extended to the New Mexico and Utah borders and eleven counties in Kansas. That area in itself was an extremely large AOR without AOOs. Prior to regionalization they experienced more refusals for pick-ups in those outlying areas than acceptances. This caused them and the government additional dollars to select other modes of transportation (DPM) in order to get shipment(s) picked up. This occurred even though carriers who submitted LOIs indicated they would service JPPSO-COS's AOR.

Industries question as to whether the AF considered economic and transportation factors in establishing the AOOs within the AOR's at JPPSO-COS and JPPSO-SAT is YES. As a result we are seeing that regionalization has re-enforced each carrier's commitment to comply with their LOI as well as the Tender of Service and have saved the DoD and AF not only transportation dollars but manpower funding as well.

SUMMARY: Closed 23 Sep 03

ITEM: 285

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Policy and Business Process Team

SUBJECT: MTMC Website

INITIATED: August 12, 2003

DISCUSSION: The MTMC website is very difficult to navigate. There is a page listing “new” items, but it rarely is updated and does not include most newly posted items. The FAQ section is also not being updated. The last response on domestic rates was dated April 2002. The last response on TQAP was from January 2002. MTMC asked us to bring up simple questions on the website and save the larger issues for the M/I meetings. Some carriers have submitted questions that were never responded to.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should fix its website to make it more user friendly. An accurate “new” items page is essential to this process. MTMC should also indicate whether carriers should continue to use the FAQ portion of the website or use other means to get questions answered.

RESPONSE: *The SDDC Web Team has made great strides in improving the new site. Positive user response has been received on the look and feel of the website. With an easier menu to navigate, users are more apt to return for future visits. The web site is running with no indication of inefficiency, with the help of a smoother/more sophisticated server system in place. “New Items and Initiatives” will still be loaded on a case-by-case basis, but recently there has been no new content to be posted on those web locals. Quality Control is still being conducted, and we’ve observed that web links are working well. However, we are still running into a few “404 Page not found errors”. The Passenger & Personal Property Web Content Managers are working with the SDDC Web Team to catch those errors. FAQ pages are being updated more rapidly as the cache of old messages are being cleared. This results in improved response time. We continue to encourage our end users to submit questions and concerns to the SDDC Web Team, to include any positive comments on our web functionality.*

SUMMARY: *Closed 23 Sep 03*

ITEM: 286

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Team

SUBJECT: Rate Solicitation, Item 424, Note – Destination Agent Selection

INITIATED: July 8, 2003

DISCUSSION: When determining the correct SIT agent to accept carriers SIT, PPSO's routinely ignore the fact that a carrier has an LOI on file with specific agent(s) listed. Instead, PPSO's many times believe that purely the nearest DOD agent; regardless of carrier-agent affiliation, is to be used on their inbound shipments. PPSO's are...

- a) Refusing to allow carriers to place their SIT into the carrier's agent warehouse because a different agent, not affiliated with the carrier is closer and/or within 30 miles of the destination city shown in block 18 of the GBL.
- b) Denying DD Forms 619-1 excess mileage certification of SIT drayage beyond 30 miles when the carrier correctly places an SIT shipment in its own, closest agent's warehouse in accordance with Item 412 of the rate solicitation.

These points above appear to directly contrast with the 'Note' portion of Item 412 on page 4-56 of RSD7 (page 4-55 of RSD8) which states "The carrier should use the carrier's DOD approved facility nearest the destination city or installation shown in Block #18."

RECOMMENDATION: HQ, MTMC should post a message on its website that reiterates, in accordance with Item 412, destination SIT agent selection is to be made based on the carrier's nearest agent. Also, if the carrier's nearest agent is over 30 miles from the destination city, Section 3 or 6 rates (as applicable using the rate solicitation) are to be authorized.

RESPONSE: *MTMC will clarify this issue by sending out a TMA message that specifies carriers are to use and be compensated for using their own agents' facilities for storage. Carrier should report any problems with obtaining proper authorization/approval to the appropriate military service headquarters. Project date of TMA release is 1 Oct 03.*

SUMMARY: Closed 23 Sep 03. A personal property advisory message is on the web (DTG 222114Z Sep 03) and was disseminated to all personal property shipping offices.

ITEM: 288

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Team

SUBJECT: Item 412 (Loading & Unloading Charges – Bulky Articles)
– Large-Screen Televisions

INITIATED: July 7, 2003

DISCUSSION: Televisions that use cathode ray tubes that are 40” in diagonal measurement as well as projection units with diagonal measurements of 65” are fast becoming popular among members. HDTV units are yet even wider than standard TV’s. These delicate electronic units are indeed very large and bulky items to handle. The D6’s “Note” verbiage was changed in D7 to state that individual PPSOs shall decide if an item is a bulky article when it is not specifically listed in Item 412. PPSO confusion has resulted with some still treating large-screen TVs as bulky items and authorizing use of the industry’s commercial tariff charge for the handling while others are rejecting all similar industry authorization requests indicating that large-screen TVs are not bulky articles. D8’s ‘Note’ section of Item 412 now goes a step further by stating that the commercial tariff has no application at all.

RECOMMENDATION: If it is MTMC’s desire to use commercial practice, MTMC indeed should follow the industry commercial practice of allowing bulky article charges for large screen televisions. MTMC should add “Large-Screen Televisions” as a billable article in Item 412 along with the other items defined as bulky in the HGCB 400 series tariff thereby creating uniformity and reducing PPSO authorization request workload. Excusing the latter, MTMC should amend its “Note” section of Item 412 to enable PPSO uniformity in bulky article authorization requests for Large-Screen Televisions and allow the use of industry’s commercial tariff for the handling of these articles.

RESPONSE: MTMC has reviewed your request regarding “Large Screen Televisions” as a bulky item effective DW 03. Large Screen Televisions 48’and over will be added to the bulky article, Item 412. Please refer to item 295.

SUMMARY: Closed 23 Sep 03

ITEM: 289

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualification and Performance Team

SUBJECT: Paperwork on TQAP appeals

INITIATED: August 12, 2003

DISCUSSION: What proof must the carrier provide to the origin TO to prove that a shipment is still in SIT when a shipment has been scored by the origin TO and shouldn't have been? We contend that the only information that we have is the SIT number and that the government orders shipments into and out of SIT and they should know. The TO in this case denied our appeal and stated that we must provide a letter from the SIT agent that states the shipment is still in SIT.

RECOMMENDATION: TOs should use the SIT number provided to verify with the destination TO whether the shipment remains in SIT, rather than requesting additional documentation from the carrier when such documentation doesn't exist.

RESPONSE: *Agree that carriers should not be required to provide additional documentation to verify that a shipment is in SIT. PPSO's scoring shipments needing to verify whether a shipment is in SIT should do so by contacting the PPSO responsible for issuing the SIT number and who should know the status of the shipment i.e., whether it remains in SIT or has been delivered out. A message was sent to all PPSO's DTG 121701Z NOV 03.*

SUMMARY: *Closed 23 Sep 03*

ITEM: 290

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Claims Services/DFAS

SUBJECT: Salvage Agreement – Memorandum of Understanding;
How long does the claims office have to resolve Member salvage reluctance?

INITIATED: July 7, 2003

DISCUSSION: In accordance with the Salvage Agreement / Military – Industry Memorandum of Understanding, industry can assert rights to salvage on item(s) in which the member was paid either actual cash value or replacement value. IAW the MOU, industry communicates these rights directly to Members typically using certified mail. It is not uncommon for Members to ignore these salvage requests. Depending on branch, Industry then asks either the entity that is exercising the government’s subrogation (USA, USN, and USMC) or the claims office that is local to the shipment’s destination (USAF and USCG).

When the Member ignores industry’s salvage request, the carrier typically creates a letter asking the proper claims handling office for assistance. These letters also appear to be ignored until the carrier creates an offer letter that takes the appropriate 25% salvage denial credit.

RECOMMENDATION: The services have agreed to allow industry 30 days from receipt of Demand on Carrier to request salvage. Likewise, it would seem to reason that the Government should be allowed 30 days (or other reasonable, pre-set time limit) to compel a response from the Member and provide the carrier with assistance in asserting its rights of salvage with the Member. In the event Government does not fulfill such obligation, then it should forgo the 25% salvage denial credit. A more proactive MOU requirement for the Government may reduce the number of salvage denial credits the Government is exposed to.

RESPONSE: *The agreement on salvage listed here provides that the carrier will attempt to pick-up items for which they claim salvage within the 30 days and not merely that it will request salvage within 30 days. While the agreement does not provide a specific time for the assisting claims office to respond to the request of the carrier for assistance in making*

arrangements for the carrier to exercise salvage rights, it is understood that the claims office will respond in a reasonable time and a professional manner. The 30 day period can be extended if the claims office and the member agree, which they must if the carrier has been prevented from its exercising its right due to non cooperation. Because members can be deployed or on temporary duty for extended periods of time, it would not be practical for there to be a set time in which to respond to carriers request with a definitive answer. If a carrier is having a problem with a particular base/installation claims office, let the Claims Service for that claims office know and the Claims Service will contact the claims office.

SUMMARY: Closed 23 Sep 03

ITEM: 291

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Claims Services

SUBJECT: Positive Tracing Action – Where does Industry send the recovered items?

INITIATED: July 7, 2003

DISCUSSION: Standard industry practice is to send missing items that have been located through tracing directly to the Member/Property Owner. Some PPSO claims offices are requiring that industry send the items to their office so they can verify that the Member/Property Owner receives the missing items. If such items are large (e.g., Dresser), this places an unnecessary burden on the Member to transport the item to his/her residence.

RECOMMENDATION: PPSO rules that are unique by claims office create a condition that is likely to cause confusion for Members and Industry. Government should decide where it wants items that were missing sent...the Property Owner or the PPSO claims office.

RESPONSE: Positive tracer results are sent to the servicing PPSO.

- 1. Where no claim has been paid [PPSO has contacted the local military service claims office and has gotten a negative response] - The PPSO will contact the member/property owner by the quickest means possible to inform member/property owner to make arrangements for delivery to the service member.***
- 2. Where a claim has been filed and paid – [PPSO contacts the local claims office and determines that a claim has been paid] - PPSO personnel, local claims personnel, and carrier personnel will coordinate with member/property owner as to when and where delivery will occur.***

SUMMARY: Closed 23 Sep 03

ITEM: 292

PROPONENT: Alaska Movers Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Operations Team

SUBJECT: Plastic Totes

INITIATED: August 14, 2003

DISCUSSION: The issue is the mandatory packing of plastic totes in order to avoid tape damage to the tote. MTMC's recent message gives the member two options. The first option is to have every tote unpacked and repacked by the carrier in carrier containers. The second option is to have the carrier pack the tote in a carton.

Practically speaking the second option is not an option because cartons are not available that meet the dimensional requirements of all totes. Totes come in various shapes and sizes and cartons do not. Our sources in the packaging industry indicate that for them to provide cartons a standard tote size would be required. There isn't a standard tote size.

Because option 2 is not available, the carrier will have to repack all totes in order to comply with the directive. As packing agents it is our experience that totes are used for many purposes from tools to seasonal decorations to toys. Members typically pack totes in order to organize their belongings in a way that is easy for them to use and recognize. In many cases items packed in totes are used once a year and then put away, such as Christmas decorations. Members who use totes use them to organize their personal belongings. Forcing the mover to repack all totes in cartons will not increase security, nor will it make the move easier for the member. It will simply force the member to reorganize items into empty totes when they arrive at their new duty assignment.

We believe it is the packer's responsibility to ask the member their preference regarding how they want totes handled. Our experience as packing agents is that members almost universally want items left in totes.

RECOMMENDATION: Because items left in totes are done almost universally at the member's request we suggest a third option is given. That third option would allow the member to advise the carrier to

leave the totes packed. If the member wants the items left in the totes, the carrier could pack the tote in a box, if a box is available that fits the tote and charge for this service, or the carrier could wrap the tote in pads in order to protect it and its contents.

It is our experience that members are fully capable of making informed choices regarding the handling of their possessions. If a member wants the items left in the tote the requirement should be that the carriers simply must protect the tote from damage and secure its contents, this would include damage from tape. We do not think MTMC has to spell out how an item is protected or secured. The carrier is responsible for protecting totes and the carrier should be left to do the job.

Allowing the member to chose how they want their items handled does not lessen the obligation of the carrier to check totes and repack items that are not safely packed such as glass or books. It does not lessen the obligation of the carrier to move the tote and its contents safely. It simply is a common sense approach to a packing issue that is supported by the Alaska Movers Association and the Transportation Offices in Alaska.

If MTMC refuses to allow military members the right to make this third choice, we request that this directive be postponed until it is determined that leaving items in plastic totes has led to serious claims, until packaging is made available for plastic totes or postponed until the industry and local transportation offices have more time for comments. Today, some transportation offices are enforcing the directives and some aren't.

RESPONSE: MTMC is willing to re-address this policy. However, industry needs to provide one position on whether members can choose to leave the contents in the plastic totes. The current policy that leaves the decision to the carrier was made primarily due to carrier concerns of liability.

SUMMARY: A Traffic Management Advisory was sent out revising the MTMC policy on plastic totes/tubs, DTG 191920Z DEC 03. The revised policy no longer requires carriers to place the plastic tote/tub in a carton when it moves with contents. However, the carrier must take action to secure and protect the tote/tub for safe transportation.

Closed 23 Sep 03

ITEM: 293

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Operations Team

SUBJECT: Extending RDDs

INITIATED: August 14, 2003

DISCUSSION: We have recently been advised that JPPSO Colorado Springs is taking the position that they will not modify the RDD on any shipment once the offering have been accepted by the carrier. Carriers often ask for RDD extensions when it is known that it will not be an inconvenience to the member and it facilitates the carrier's transportation schedule. This saves the government SIT expense and also helps assure more direct deliveries, which ought to be a mutual goal of the DOD and the moving industry. This issue has also been discussed numerous times in the past as many other PPSO's (thought not all) refuse to modify RDD's once they are established.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should once again provide guidance to all PPSO's, including JPPSO Colorado Springs, that RDD's may be changed/extended if there is no member inconvenience involved.

RESPONSE: *If the member agrees, there should be no problem lengthening the transit time if the shipment is still at origin and the PPGBL/BL has not been issued. However, once the PPGBL/BL has been issued, these requests will become an administrative burden to the PPSOs as they would have to issue GBL correction notices. With manpower shortages at the PPSO offices, this recommendation is not feasible once the PPGBL/BL has been issued.*

SUMMARY: *Closed 23 Sep 03*

ITEM: 294

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Operations Team

SUBJECT: Retroactive Conversion/SIT Expiration

INITIATED: August 14, 2003

DISCUSSION: There is a continuing problem with destination PPSOs not making timely decisions backed by required documentation to extend SIT on shipments prior to the authorized period of SIT expiring. The carrier has a right to know on which shipments it retains legal liability. The GBL states that SIT is authorized for up to 90 days, or more. Once the last day has passed and the base has not provided a written extension, the interstate nature of the shipment is terminated and the storage is converted to commercial storage at the member's expense. However, we have had instances of the destination PPSO advising that SIT probably will not be extended but they refuse to "convert" the shipment to member's expense until they reach the member, often after SIT has expired. This is an ongoing problem, which has been discussed at other M/I's in the past.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should once again provide guidance to all PPSO's that prior to the expiration of SIT on a shipment, they need to provide disposition instructions to the carrier, either extending the SIT for a defined period of time or converting the shipment to member expense or NTS at government expense, per DTR 406.A.2.c. This section states: "When SIT is extended beyond the first 90 days, the TO shall notify the carrier of the extension and the projected termination date. A copy of the DD Form 1857, Temporary Commercial Storage at Government Expense, or inbound arrival/expiration notice letter, if automated, will be provided to the carrier for each extended 90-day period. When a shipment remains in storage beyond the SIT entitlement period, carrier liability shall terminate at midnight of the last day of the SIT period, the PPGBL character of the shipment shall cease and the warehouse shall become the final destination of the shipment." Retroactive extensions are not permitted and PPSOs need to be reminded of that fact.

RESPONSE: *The issue is addressed in the new DTR, which became effective 6 Aug 03. Where the current provision is that the SIT will automatically convert at the end of*

the specified time period, the revised provision contained in Chapter 406A.2.c states “carrier liability will terminate at midnight of the last day the carrier or warehouseman receives written notice from the TO that the entitlement has ended.” This indicates affirmative action by the PPSO to terminate the SIT. Without such action, the SIT continues at government expense and the PPGBL/BL character of the shipment continues. A TMA providing clarification on what constitutes the written documentation will be provided to all PPSOs. A copy of the TMA will be placed on the MTMC Web site.

SUMMARY: Open. MTMC and the military services will discuss this issue at the next Personal Property Coordinating Council.

ITEM: 295

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Team

SUBJECT: Bulky Articles

INITIATED: August 14, 2003

DISCUSSION: Item 412 in the new RSD8 has been modified so that the commercial tariff has no application for bulky items that are authorized to be shipped but do not have a charge associated with them listed in the RSD8. This goes against commercial practice in that there are commonly occurring items that should have a bulky charge (big screen TV's for example). This unfairly reduces the compensation available to the hauling agent handling such bulky articles.

RECOMMENDATION: That MTMC reinstate the language that referred to the commercial tariff for bulky items not listed in Item 412, add those items to the D-8, or explain why such charges should not be payable.

RESPONSE: *In researching D-8, Item 412 based on manufacturers dimensions and shipping weight a comparison was made. Using the manufacturers dimensions the individual items were cubed and using 7 pounds per cubic foot a cube weight was established and compared to the manufacturers shipping weight to determine which was the lowest weight. In the interest of fairness either actual weight or cubed weight, which ever is the lower, was used to establish whether the individual item would be considered as a bulky item and an additional fee would apply. If the actual weight is more than the cubed weight a bulky article charge is not justified.*

Regarding the questions of special handling, if an item requires special handling and is not listed in Item 412, carriers may request additional labor charges from the responsible PPSO. Additional labor can be authorized to ensure items can be moved safely and to prevent possible damage to the item(s) or injury to the moving crew. In an effort to simplify and remove confusion at the local transportation offices, bulky articles will be located in one place and that source will be the Domestic Solicitation.

SUMMARY: Closed 23 Sep 03

ITEM: 296

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Services (USAF)

SUBJECT: Agent Representation in TOPS

INITIATED: August 14, 2003

DISCUSSION: The agent information reports generated by TOPS are supposed to show which carriers each agent represents. At some bases, such as JPPSO-COS, these reports do not correspond with the LOIs that has been accepted by the base. Some agents only have one or two carriers shown on the TOPS report, while several other carriers have listed them on their LOIs. Other agents have more than the permitted 5 carriers for domestic. In some cases, agents in one zone are listed as being in all four zones.

It appears that some bases may be overwhelmed by the LOIs they receive and may not be inputting the information properly into TOPS. There probably is some frustration about the number of LOI changes that need to be processed.

RECOMMENDATION: PPSOs should work with carriers and agents to give easier visibility into the lists of which agents represent which carriers so that industry can help ensure that the TOPS records are accurate.

RESPONSE: *JPPSO-COS continues to monitor the agent/carrier ratio to insure it is in compliance with DTR Part IV. However, the agent information report is a very fluid document that changes frequently based upon the volumes of LOI updates, changes, and cancellations received. Reports are reviewed to insure the LOI data being entered into TOPS is accurate. Carriers with specific questions need to provide additional information so that JPPSO-COS can then verify. AF has also advised JPPSO-COS to inform any agents/carriers that when an agent wants to drop a domestic carrier, the agent will not be allowed to add another carrier. Rather JPPSO-COS will attrite them out until no agent represents more than 5 domestic carriers.*

SUMMARY: *Closed 23 Sep 03*

ITEM: 297

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualification and Performance Team

SUBJECT: Batch Mail Dates

INITIATED: August 14, 2003

DISCUSSION: MTMC recently issued a Personal Property Advisory Message, which was supposed to help clarify some issues. Section 4 of that message refers to DD1780's that are dated within one batch mail period but not postmarked till the next, when the next batch mail period falls into a new evaluation cycle. The message states "shipments are counted in the evaluation cycle it was scored." Unfortunately, this leaves the area wide open for bases to score shipments, put a date on the form and then not mail them till long after the required batch mail date. The carrier is unable to forecast its TQAP scores and cannot make appropriate operational or rate filing plans. Section 4 of the message also goes on to state that "completed copies of the DD Form 1780 are to be batch mailed to the carrier by First Class mail on the 15th and the last day of the month, excluding weekends and federal holidays." Actually, the mailing should occur on the 15th or the 30th of the month, not the last day of the month. If PPSOs follow this latter advice, then there should not be any situation where a carrier is sent a score dated in one evaluation cycle but mailed/postmarked in another.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should once again simplify this whole process by use of the postmark on the envelope in which 1780's are received as the determining factor for which evaluation period they fall in and what the appeal period is, just as the carrier must meet the same postmark deadline in making sure its appeals are filed timely. Leaving it open as far as the date on the 1780 itself invites abuse and scoring/inclusion of shipments past the cutoff period for evaluation cycles.

RESPONSE: *The ability to have TOPS print semi-annual TQAP scores on the last day of the cycle is already available, and therefore does not require a modification to the system. PPSOs have the capability to request TOPS print TQAP scores for any period they wish to review.*

MTMC stands by its message of 4 April 03. The intent is to count shipments in the evaluation cycle in which they are scored, not in which they are postmarked.

SUMMARY: Close 23 Sep 03

ITEM: 298

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Operations Team

SUBJECT: Saturation Notices

INITIATED: August 14, 2003

DISCUSSION: MTMC advised in a Personal Property Advisory Message that saturation notices would only be accepted from carriers. This advisory came about as a result of carriers' concerns that at JPPSO COS, JPPSO SAT and JPPSO NE, if the PPSO accepts saturation notices from agents, it shuts the carrier down from business for the whole AOR, not just for the agent who is declaring saturation. Now MTMC has rescinded that message and states that they will accept saturation notices from agents.

RECOMMENDATION: That MTMC re-affirm that it will only accept saturation notices from the carrier, not from the carrier's agent(s). This will allow the **carrier** to provide managed transportation (see response to previous item 261/259).

RESPONSE: *Keeping industry's comments in mind that the procedures for both domestic and international programs should be as standardized as possible, MTMC believes that the recommendation is not feasible as it creates an administrative nightmare to the PPSOs, especially overseas. Instead, MTMC feels that carriers should instruct their agents not to submit saturation notices without notification to the carrier it represents. Also, carriers have the option of naming themselves as the booking agent on the LOI. AF recommended that JPPSO's should not be placed in the position of monitoring/managing the saturation notices submitted by an agent listed on a carrier's LOI. Carriers should provide instructions to their agents and have the option of naming themselves as the booking agent on their LOI if they want to limit issuance of saturation notices.*

SUMMARY: *Closed 23 Sep 03*

ITEM: 299

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Personal Property Systems Team

SUBJECT: PPCIG Format

INITIATED: August 14, 2003

DISCUSSION: The PPCIG format is difficult to use in that one must search the base document and all updates for a current listing for any given PPSO.

RECOMMENDATION: Is there some way that the PPCIG information can be consolidated as it is updated?

RESPONSE: *The PPCIG is consolidated and the changes are listed.*

SUMMARY: *Closed 23 Sep 03*

ITEM: 300

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualification and Performance Team

SUBJECT: Digital Certificates

INITIATED: August 14, 2003

DISCUSSION: Digital Certificates will be required in October, but many carriers and agents are not familiar with them or with what specific uses will require a digital certificate. In addition, there are issues with multiple individuals needing a certificate per company, and with single individuals who represent multiple companies.

RECOMMENDATION: An ETA person familiar with digital certificates should make a presentation and be available to answer questions to provide additional information about which specific functions will require a digital certificate, who will need them, and how to handle the multiple access issues. Since the M/I is just a week before the planned effective date, MTMC should consider postponing the effective date to ensure that carriers will have enough information and time to comply.

RESPONSE: *MTMC's office of Information Management will make a presentation at the MI regarding digital certificates, i.e., who needs them, how they work, where to obtain them, etc. MTMC has also requested and just received approval from the Department of Defense to extend the mandatory implementation date for digital certificates. The new date is tentatively set for spring 2004. We will post information and send out an email when a firm implementation date has been determined. Until then, MTMC systems will be accessible using either a user-id/password or a digital certificate.*

SUMMARY: *The Carrier Industry will need digital Certificates to access DOD web-enabled systems starting April 2004. In the future, email sent between DOD and external government or private sector entities will need to be digitally signed using DOD-approved certificates when data integrity, message authenticity, or non-repudiation are required. Also in the future, emails will need to be digitally encrypted when the following types of information is being sent: (1) information protected by the Privacy Act; (2) information classified as "For Official Use Only (FOUO); and (3) sensitive but unclassified data. DOD has not finalized a date for the requirement for digitally signed emails and digitally encrypted messages. When this is*

finalized the information will be posted in the Help section of the MTMC ETA Home Page (<https://eta.mtmc.army.mil/help.asp#CertFAQ>).

The decision to use digital certificates between carriers and their agents is strictly up to the parties involved not DOD or MTMC.

In the future, carriers will need digital certificates to communicate with MTMC and other DOD agencies. It is up to the discretion of the carrier whether they want to use digital certificates in communicating with other carriers.

This is DOD-wide initiative. DOD established the guidelines provided by MTMC. As of April 2004, all DOD web-enabled applications will require a DOD-approved digital certificate.

The MTMC ETA system (<https://eta.mtmc.army.mil/help.asp#CertFAQ>) has useful information regarding the DOD PKI initiative as well as links to DOD sites. An ETA account is not required to view the help information.

SUMMARY: Closed 23 Sep 03

ITEM: 301

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Claims Services/DFAS

SUBJECT: Delayed Setoff Notices

INITIATED: August 14, 2003

DISCUSSION: We have recently received dozens of setoffs on claims going back 5, 6 or 7 years since the last correspondence. We understand that other carriers have also received setoffs on very old files. Receiving setoffs so late severely hampers a carrier's ability to conduct further investigation and to recover any claims monies owed by agents involved in the shipments. Is there some reason that so many setoffs have been delayed so long? In some cases, there was a response from the carrier to the claims office, but no reply received from the claims office for years until the setoff.

RECOMMENDATION: The Claims Services should advise if there was a recently discovered stockpile of files or what has precipitated this avalanche of setoffs and why so much time has elapsed. What can the Claims Services do to prevent this in the future?

RESPONSE from DFAS: All Army claims are current. We are currently working June 2003 claims. Carriers are informed via letter before we process any claim for offset.

RESPONSE from Air Force: The Air Force discovered an incompatibility between the Air Force Data System and the Defense Finance and Accounting Service Data Base. Sometime in the March/April time frame, industry representatives of the MTMC Future Personal Property Program, "Family First," claims team were informed that the problem had been discovered and that there would be about 2800 Air Force setoffs involved. There are currently approximately 250 of those files remaining.

SUMMARY: Closed 23 Sep 03

ITEM: 302

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Claims Services

SUBJECT: Estimates for Replacement Costs

INITIATED: August 14, 2003

DISCUSSION: Some Claims Offices are taking the position that the carrier must provide replacement cost figures for claimed items within 45 days of receipt of the DD1840 or DD1840R, whichever is later, or they will not be accepted in the claims settlement process. The MOU does not state this and specifically refers to estimates of repair not replacement costs. Furthermore, the carrier does not know which items the member is going to claim until the claim is actually filed, which may be 2 years or longer following delivery.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Claims Offices be instructed to accept and consider carrier replacement estimates if they are provided at the time of settlement negotiation.

RESPONSE: *Claims offices will review any item that the carrier wishes to submit. If that submission occurs after the claim is paid, however, the claims office will demand from the carrier the value of the item lost as established in the claims file. Claims paid with sufficient objective information on the value of the item are recoverable unless the carrier can establish that the agency's assessment of the carrier's liability was wrong or can prove the unreasonableness of the assessment by clear and convincing evidence. Therefore, if a reasonable, objective determination was made that a missing item had a value of \$250 and after the demand on the carrier is made the carrier shows that they could have purchased the item for \$225, the claims office can consider the information but they are not required to accept that amount.*

SUMMARY: *Closed 23 Sep 03*

ITEM: 303

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Claims Service/DFAS

SUBJECT: Table of Weights and Depreciation Guide

INITIATED: September 2, 2003

DISCUSSION: DFAS IN has finally started providing documentation to the transportation providers when advising on unearned freight deductions, a new practice Industry applauds. Prior to this it was difficult, if not impossible to find out how the deductions were calculated. In reviewing recent protests to these deductions it was learned that DFAS does not use the Joint Military Industry table of weights and depreciation guide to assign weights to items subject to the unearned freight deduction. Apparently their process or determiner is very arbitrary.

RECOMMENDATION: Since the Joint Military/Industry table weights and guide is used to determine weight in the process of settling claims then it should also be used to determine individual item or shipment weights in unearned freight deductions.

RESPONSE: *Letters are always provided informing carriers on actions taken on unearned freight deductions. DFAS-IN uses many resources to determine actual weight. In some cases, items are not listed in the Industry table of weights or the weight listed is well below the actual weight of the item. In those cases we use the Internet or various catalogs to determine the weight. Actual weight determination is largely based on the level of research preformed by each individual examiner.*

SUMMARY: *Closed 23 Sep 03*

ITEM: 304

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Personal Property Program & Acquisition Services

SUBJECT: Non-Temp Storage Issues

INITIATED: September 11, 2003

INITIATED: At the last M/I chaired by Col. Hunt, the question of the non-temp program and its revision was brought up. Specifically, the ability to change rates upward to reflect economics such as fuel taxes and insurance to name just a few items. At present, the rules permit rate changes upward twice a year but allow lower rates every month. We feel this is a gross injustice since non temp contractors do not enjoy the fuel surcharge.

We also would like to point out it has been over ten years since the last meeting was held chaired by Frank Galluzzo dealing with non-temp and DPM problems, and we were promised another such meeting by Col. Hunt at some point in the future to address current issues with those programs. We also were told that the method of bidding non-temp shipments would be reviewed since in present terms a low bidder would in some instances not be considered the low aggregate bidder if he had one item that went up in his total low bid. This means the real low bidder would not be considered.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should revise the timing for non-temp bids to permit monthly increases as well as decreases. A working group from MTMC and industry should meet to discuss issues in the NTS and DPM programs.

RESPONSE: *Non-temp storage is part of Families First Program, and will therefore be included in the business rules review process. The Military Services and Industry will be invited to participate in discussion of the issues. Accordingly, no changes will be made to the current process.*

SUMMARY: *Closed 23 Sep 03*